REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 11, 2007. Claims 1, 4 to 12 and 14 to 22 are in the application, with Claims 19 to 22 having been added herein. Claims 1 and 12 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0027593 (Wilkins) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,981 (Zalewski), Claims 4, 6 to 8, 10, 11 and 15 were rejected under § 103(a) over Wilkins in view of Zalewski and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,740 (Cockrill), and Claims 5 and 9 were rejected under § 103(a) over Wilkins in view of Zalewski and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,654 (Hiroya). The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention relates to undoing execution of a function on a computer object by a server station, and providing a user with a sum of electronic money in the form of an electronic money coin for the undoing of the execution of the function on the computer object. According to the invention, when a server station receives an undo request from a client station, the server station obtains an earlier state of a manipulated computer object. The server generates an amount of electronic money associated with the client station, and a response is sent to the client station. The response comprises a sum of electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin and the sum is less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server for the execution of the function. Therefore, where a user may initially request that the server station execute a function on

the computer object and pays for the operation, but then later wants to have the operation undone, the user is provided with an amount of electronic money in the form of an electronic money coin for the undo operation.

With specific reference to the claim language, independent Claim 1 is a method of undoing execution of a function requested by a first client station on a computer object stored on a server station of a communication network, comprising the following steps, receiving, from a client station, a request to undo execution of the function on the computer object, the execution of the function being an operation to manipulate the object from an earlier state of the object to a manipulated state of the object, obtaining, on the server station, the earlier state of the manipulated object, generating electronic money on the server station, associated with the first client station, and sending a response to the first client station via the communication network, the response comprising a sum of the electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin, less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function.

Independent Claim 12 is an apparatus claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 12, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a server station receiving, from a client station, a request to undo execution of a function on a computer object, the execution of the function being an operation to manipulate the object from an earlier state of the object to a manipulated state of the object, generating on the server station electronic money

associated with the client station, and sending a response to the client station that sent the undo request, where the response comprises a sum of electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin, less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function.

Wilkins is seen to convert low-resolution images into high-resolution images. However, as readily admitted in the Office Action, Wilkins fails to teach generating electronic money on the server station, and sending a response to a first client station that sent an undo request, where the response comprises a sum of electronic money less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function.

Zalewski is seen to disclose a mobile radio communication unit that includes an intelligent cover that has a transponder that is responsive to an interrogation by an electric field so as to provide an identification number and other information in response to an interrogation signal. Digital Money or coupons may be loaded into the mobile communication unit using the transponder equipped cover and the user can pay for items using the mobile device. Digital money can be reloaded into the mobile communication unit. The Office Action alleges that Zalewski provides a response that includes a sum of money less than or equal to the cost for the purchase of a gift certificate, which is apparently being alleged as teaching the feature of sending a response to a request to undo a function on an object, where the response includes a sum of electronic money less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server for the execution of the function. While the provision of a discount in Zalewski may be somewhat similar to a

refund, any comparison ends there. Specifically, the invention ties together the payment for execution of a function on a computer object from an earlier state to a manipulated state, then requesting undoing of the execution of the function and providing an amount of money less than or equal to the cost for the execution of the function. The two are quite clearly different processes and merely providing a refund or discount for a gift certificate is not the same as a partial refund (i.e., amount less than or equal to) of the amount paid for executing an operation on a computer object. Therefore, incorporating the features of Zalewski into Wilkins would not have rendered the invention obvious.

Cockrill and Hiroya have been studied but are not seen to add anything that, when combined with Wilkins and/or Zalewski, would have resulted in at least the features of a server station receiving, from a client station, a request to undo execution of a function on a computer object, the execution of the function being an operation to manipulate the object from an earlier state of the object to a manipulated state of the object, generating on the server station electronic money associated with the client station, and sending a response to the client station that sent the undo request, where the response comprises a sum of electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin, less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, independent Claims 1 and 12, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Attorney for Applicants
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2033781v1